


**REMARKS**

Applicant submits this Supplemental Preliminary Amendment to correct typographical errors in the specification and to replace claims 1-10 with new claims 11-69.

Applicant submits that no new matter has been added and that the claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas F. Presson

Reg. No. 41,442

Telephone (203) 924-3845

PITNEY BOWES INC.  
Intellectual Property and  
Technology Law  
Department  
35 Waterview Drive  
P.O. Box 3000  
Shelton, CT 06484-8000


**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks,  
Washington, D.C. 20231,

on August 9, 2002  
Date of Deposit

Thomas Presson  
Name of Rep.

  
Signature

August 9, 2002  
Date



U.S. Serial No. 09/750,952

Attorney Docket No. F-234

Group Art Unit 2154

**Version With Markings To Show Changes Made**

The following paragraphs show insertions and [deletions] to the Specification.

Please replace the paragraph beginning at page 2, line 14, with the following rewritten paragraph:

Currently, there is no effective means in place for address correction of e-mail addresses. Even if the e-mail sender is highly diligent, there are no resources or processes available to identify corrected electronic address information. The problem is further accentuated by the fact that extreme competition in internet service providers, and likewise e-mail service providers, results in extremely high [obsolesce] obsolescence of e-mail addresses with no means for e-mail forwarding (e.g., closing an AOL e-mail account provides no option for forwarding e-mail intended for that account to a new e-mail address).

Please replace the paragraph beginning at page 10, line 23, with the following rewritten paragraph:

Preferably, the messaging system 600 operates within an enterprise (e.g., having a single computer or within an intranet) or may operate in the public domain where non-affiliated users may utilize the information to improve address hygiene with the result being that digital document delivery success is enhanced. In essence, and as described in further detail below, the present invention enables the successful delivery of an e-mail to a person without knowing the person knowing the complete or correct e-mail address. In a first embodiment for

messaging system 600 and illustrated in Fig. 6, messaging system 600 is to be understood to operate in the public domain with that of system 44 shown in Fig. 1.

Please replace the paragraph beginning at page 11, line 4, with the following rewritten paragraph:

In reference to Figs. 7a and 7b, its method of operation will now be described. First, when an email sender 12 desires to transmit a message to a recipient 40 having either what is thought as a known e-mail address, or an educated guess of the recipient's e-mail address (e.g., Douglas.Quine@pb.com) as described above, the sender 12 nevertheless transmits the e-mail message through conventional e-mail protocol, whereby the message is delivered to the identified domain name mail server 36 (e.g., pb.com) specified in the recipient's e-mail address (e.g., Douglas.[q]Quine@pb.com), via the senders ISP server 18 (step 600). The specified domain name mail server 36 then receives the e-mail message (step 602), and if the e-mail account is not recognized by the domain name mail server 36 (e.g., Douglas.[q] Quine@pb.com) (step 604), then the specified domain name mail server 36 rejects the request and sends an undeliverable message (e.g., a MAIL-DAEMON message) back to the sender 12, via the sender's e-mail server 18 indicating that the message is not deliverable (step 610). As described above, the sender's e-mail server 18 then sends the message to the sender 12 that the attached e-mail message is undeliverable.

Please replace the paragraph beginning at page 11, line 19, with the following rewritten paragraph:

With continuing reference to Fig. 7a, since the sender 12 was unsuccessful in delivering the e-mail message to the recipient, the sender then forwards the e-mail message to the messaging forwarding system 600 of the present invention (step 620). The messaging forwarding system 600 then receives the forwarded

e-mail message (step 622), and as described above, determines if a forwarding address has been registered for the undeliverable forwarded e-mail message (step 624). If yes, the above described process of step 210 is then performed. If no, a determination is then made as to whether the domain name address (e.g., pb.com) of the undeliverable e-mail address (e.g. Douglas.[q]Quine@pb.com) has been registered with the messaging forwarding system 600 (step 626). If no, then messaging system 600 then preferably sends a message back to the sender that it is unable to provide a forwarding e-mail address for the undeliverable e-mail address (step 628 ).

Please replace the paragraph beginning at page 12, line 3, with the following rewritten paragraph:

If yes, and with reference now to Fig. 7b, a determination is made as to whether an analysis to determine a "closest match" is to be performed (step 650). As will be described further below, this "closest match" determination is essentially the performance of an analysis to find the closest match to the username (e.g., douglas.quine) of the undeliverable e-mail in comparison to those usernames that are pre-registered with the messaging system 600 in association with the subject domain name address (e.g., pb.com). Preferably, and as further described below, when the administrator of the mail server 36 opens an account with the present invention messaging system 600, the administrator decides whether to list all current usernames associated with the subject domain name address (e.g. pb.com) so as to enable the performance of the closest match determination. If no "closest match" determination is to be performed (e.g., either the administrator of the subject domain name address has decided not to list all associated usernames, or has decided not to enable this feature in the messaging system) then the messaging system 600 preferably transmits an e-mail message back to the sender 12 indicating the format for usernames followed for that domain name address (e.g., pb.com) (step 652). An example of such a message is: THERE IS NO KNOWN E-MAIL ADDRESS FOR

DOUGLAS.QUINE@PB.COM - HOWEVER, THE FORMAT FOR USERNAMES RESIDING AT PB.COM IS TO USE THE FIRST SIX CHARACTERS OF THE LAST NAME FOLLOWED IMMEDIATELY BY THE FIRST TWO CHARACTERS OF THE FIRST NAME – FOR EXAMPLE: MR. TOM WATSONER WOULD BE WASTONTO@PB.COM AND MS. ADELE ZON WOULD BE ZONAD@PB.COM - TRY TO REFORMAT YOUR USERNAME IN ACCORDANCE WITH THIS FORMAT AND RE-TRANSMIT YOUR E-MAIL MESSAGE – GOOD LUCK

Please replace the paragraph beginning at page 13, line 1, with the following rewritten paragraph:

If yes, that is an analysis is to be performed for the undeliverable e-mail address (e.g., Douglas.[q]Quine@pb.com), then an analysis of the username portion (e.g., Douglas.[q]Quine) of the undeliverable e-mail address (e.g., Douglas.[q]Quine@pb.com) is performed to determine a closest match (based upon prescribed criteria) to a username(s) from all the usernames registered with the messaging system 300 that are associated with the domain name (e.g., pb.com) of the undeliverable e-mail address (step 654). A determination is then made as to whether a closest match(es) has been made (step 656). If, no then the process goes to the above described step 652. If yes, then a message is sent to the sender 12 indicating the closest match(es) that have been determined (step 658). An example of such a message is:

### **In The Abstract**

Please replace the Abstract with the following rewritten Abstract:

A method and system for forwarding an e-mail message intended to be delivered to a first e-mail address to a second e-mail address in the event the first e-mail address is disfavored. An e-mail message is sent from a first computer that was originally addressed to a first e-mail address to a second computer that

is capable of forwarding the e-mail message to a second e-mail address. The second computer receives the e-mail message and parses the first e-mail address from the e-mail message to determine if there is a second e-mail address associated with the first e-mail address. If there is a second e-mail address associated with the first e-mail address, the second computer sends the e-mail message to a third computer associated with the second e-mail address. If there is not, then the second computer determines if it can suggest a username, or a new username format to be used for the username associated with the domain name address of the disfavored e-mail address.

### **IN THE CLAIMS**

Claims 1-10 have been canceled and claims 11-69 are hereby presented for examination.